

the best record in this regard, so it is important the United States make clear that any agreements must be honored.

As we wait for the China deal to take effect, one piece of definite good news on the trade front is the arrival in the Senate of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement. After months of delay by House Democrats, USMCA is finally—finally—moving through Congress. Here in the Senate, it is advancing rapidly through the required committees, and I expect it will be received for final Senate consideration in the next few days.

Last week, I voted in support of this agreement in the Senate Finance Committee, and just this morning—a few minutes ago, in fact—I voted for this agreement in a meeting of the Senate Committee on Commerce. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement has been a big priority of mine over the past year, in particular because of the ways the agreement would benefit farmers and ranchers.

Canada and Mexico are the No. 1 and No. 2 markets for American agriculture products, and this agreement will preserve and expand farmers' access to these two critical export markets and give farmers certainty about what these markets are going to look like going forward.

I am particularly pleased about the ways that USMCA will benefit dairy farmers. If you drive the I-29 corridor north of Brookings, SD, you can see firsthand the major dairy expansion South Dakota has experienced over the past several years.

The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement will preserve U.S. dairy farmers' role as a key dairy supplier to Mexico, and it will substantially expand market access to Canada. The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that the agreement will boost U.S. dairy exports by more than \$277 million. The agreement will also expand market access for U.S. poultry and egg producers. It will make it easier for American producers to export wheat to Canada and much more.

Of course, the benefits of this agreement are not limited to farmers and ranchers. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will benefit virtually every sector of the economy, from manufacturing to digital services to the automotive industry. It will create hundreds of thousands of new jobs, boost our economic output, and increase wages for workers.

The agreement also breaks new ground by including a chapter specifically focused on small and medium-sized businesses—the first time a U.S. trade agreement has ever included a dedicated chapter on this topic.

Roughly, 120,000 small and medium-sized businesses around our country export goods and services to Mexico and Canada, including a number of businesses in my home State of South Dakota. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will make it easier for

these businesses to successfully export their products. South Dakota businesses and consumers will also benefit from the fact that the agreement maintains the current U.S. de minimis threshold, which is something I fought hard to protect.

It is too bad farmers and ranchers had to wait so long for the USMCA trade agreement. This agreement was concluded well over a year ago, and it could have been taken up much sooner. But House Democrats have, unfortunately, been more focused on playing political games than on working with Republicans to do the American people's business.

I am very glad we are taking up this agreement now, though, and I look forward to voting for final passage of USMCA in the very near future. We should get this agreement to the President's desk without delay.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today is a momentous, historic, and solemn day in the history of the U.S. Senate and in the history of our Republic. The House of Representatives will send Articles of Impeachment against President Trump to the Senate, and the Speaker will appoint the House managers of the impeachment case.

Two articles will be delivered. The first charges the President with abuse of power—of coercing a foreign leader into interfering in our elections and of using the powers of the Presidency, the most powerful public office in the Nation, to benefit himself. The second charges the President with obstruction of Congress for an unprecedented blockade of the legislature's authority to oversee and investigate the executive branch.

Let's put it a different way.

The House of Representatives has accused the President of trying to shake down a foreign leader for personal gain to help him in his campaign, and he has done everything possible to cover it up. This administration is unprecedented in its not being open, in its desire for secrecy, in its desire to prevent the public from knowing what it is doing, and it is worst of all when it comes in an impeachment trial.

The two offenses are the types of offenses the Founders had in mind when

they designed the impeachment powers of Congress. Americans and the Founding Fathers, in particular, from the very founding day of the Republic, have feared the ability of a foreign power to interfere in our elections. Americans have never wanted a foreign power to have sway over our elections, but that is what President Trump is accused of doing—of soliciting—in these articles.

I would ask my colleagues, and I would ask the American people: Do we want a foreign power determining who our President is or do we want the American voters to determine it? It is that serious. That is the central question: Who should determine who our President and our other elected officials are?

From the early days of the Republic, foreigners have tried to interfere, and from the early days of the Republic, we have resisted. Yet, according to these articles and other things he has done, President Trump seems to aid and abet it. His view is, if it is good for him, then, that is good enough. That is not America. We are a nation of laws—of the rule of law, not of the rule of one man.

So now the Senate's job is to try the case—to conduct a fair trial on these very severe charges of letting, aiding, abetting, and encouraging a foreign power to interfere in our elections and of threatening them with the cutoff of aid—and to determine if the President's offenses merit, if they are proven, the most severe punishment our Constitution imagines.

The House has made a very strong case, but, clearly, the Senators have to see that case and watch it firsthand. A fair trial means the prosecutors who make the case and the President's counsel who provide the defense have all of the evidence available. It means that Senators have all of the facts to make an informed decision. That means relevant witnesses, and that means relevant documents. We all know that. We all know—every Member of this body, Democrat or Republican—that you can't have a fair, open trial, particularly on something as weighty as impeachment, when we don't have the evidence and the facts.

The precedents of the Senate are clear. Leader MCCONNELL is constantly citing precedent. Here is one: The Senate has always heard from witnesses in impeachment trials. There have been 15 completed impeachment trials in the history of this country. In every single one of them, the Senate has heard from witnesses. Let me repeat that for Leader MCCONNELL's benefit since he is always citing the precedent of 1999. There have been 15 completed impeachment trials, including the one in 1999. In the history of this country, in every single one of them, the Senate has heard from witnesses. It would be unprecedented not to. President Johnson's impeachment trial had witnesses—41 of them. President Clinton's